

February 22, 2011

The Honorable Richard Roy Co-Chairman, Environment Committee Room 3200, Legislative Office Building Hartford, CT 06106

The Honorable Edward Meyer Co-Chairman, Environment Committee Room 3200, Legislative Office Building Hartford, CT 06106

RE: S.B. 210 Opposition

Dear Chairmen:

On behalf of the Grocery Manufacturers Association, I respectfully wish to convey our opposition to S.B. 210, "An Act Prohibiting the Use of Bisphenol-A in Thermal Receipt Paper and Increasing the Duties of the Chemical Innovations Institute," and in particular Section 2 of the bill. H.B. 210 cedes authority over the development of public policy on the subject of chemicals, and the future use of chemicals in commerce in the State of Connecticut, to an unfunded, nearly non-existent "Chemical Innovations Institute." This legislation is similar in approach to 2010's original bill H.B. 5130. That bill similarly lacked both a funding mechanism for a project of this scope and any requirement that a scientific or peer-reviewed method be employed in the compilation of the "list of chemicals that are of high toxic concern and the name of any safe alternative to any such chemical of high toxic concern."

Based in Washington, D.C., the Grocery Manufacturers Association is the voice of more than 300 leading food, beverage and consumer product companies that sustain and enhance the quality of life for hundreds of millions of people in the United States and around the globe. Founded in 1908, GMA is an active, vocal advocate for its member companies and a trusted source of information about the industry and the products consumers rely on and enjoy every day. The association and its member companies are committed to meeting the needs of consumers through product innovation, responsible business practices and effective public policy solutions developed through a genuine partnership with policymakers and other stakeholders.

In keeping with its founding principles, GMA helps its members produce safe products through a strong and ongoing commitment to scientific research, testing and evaluation and to providing consumers with the products, tools and information they need to achieve a healthy diet and an active lifestyle.

The food, beverage and consumer packaged goods industry in the United States generates sales of \$2.1 trillion annually, employs 14 million workers and contributes \$1 trillion in added value to the economy every year.

GMA and its member companies support the intent of this legislation, to ensure that consumer products with which the citizens of the State of Connecticut come in contact are safe and free of unnecessary risk to health and wellbeing. However, we believe that this legislation cedes the discretion of the Connecticut State Legislature and indeed the authority of the State of Connecticut to an unelected academic organization without benefit of a defined risk assessment process, nor even a mention of legislative or state agency oversight. The problems associated with the process outlined in this legislation are further exacerbated by the provision which would allow the institute to "consider the standards of any state, federal or international organization" in compiling the list. S.B. 210 does not even specify that the "state, federal or international organization" be governmental in nature. This language would allow even the most biased of advocacy organizations to be the originating "organization" of a list that would become a policy statement of the State of Connecticut. This is too much authority to concentrate in an academic body with no record.

The federal government best handles the study and evaluation of chemicals for approval for use in food and consumer products. While this legislature clearly has the mandate to protect the citizens of this state, we would ask that you also consider the level of expertise and dedication of our public servants at the FDA, EPA and other federal agencies that work to safeguard the public's health and safety. Given the present degree and quality of protection afforded by the extensive resources we all pay for at the federal level, Connecticut's consumers and taxpayers are well served by a fulsome and deliberate debate on the merits of a given chemical in a legislative setting. S.B. 210 would represent a legislative handoff of this responsibility to an academic body with zero accountability to the citizens of Connecticut.

Additionally, this legislation does not take into consideration any process for alternatives assessment. There is no provision in this bill that would require, or even facilitate such a process and the legislation would in fact allow a "Chemical Innovations Institute" to make recommendations for safe alternatives based on nothing more than a published list.

Given the latitude in scientific standard that is provided to the "institute" in this legislation, we believe that the committee should consider at the very least the minimum scientific credentials that might be required for a "state, federal or international organization" to be considered a source. It is also unclear if the "institute" would be required to disclose what source(s) it uses to compile its list of chemicals that are of high toxic concern, or how the safety of proposed alternatives would be evaluated. It is also unclear if the public will have an opportunity to question the scientific validity of these sources or even the conclusions of the "institute."

The provisions of this legislation which would increase the authority of this "institute" while seeming well intentioned, reach too far, consider too little in the way of science and cede a staggering level of discretion to an unaccountable academic body. For the above stated reasons we urge you to vote no on S.B. 210. I look forward to working with you and the members of the committee in the coming days and weeks to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Costa

Director, State Affairs

cc: Members, Environment Committee